

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>RICKY SAMAS,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:12-CV-2619</b>
<b>Petitioner</b>	:	
	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>ACTING WARDEN KRULESIE,</b>	:	
<b>Respondent</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 8th day of March, 2013, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Blewitt (Doc. 8), recommending that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) be dismissed, and, following an independent review of the record, and noting that respondent filed objections<sup>1</sup> to the report (Doc. 9) on February 25, 2013, and the court finding Judge Blewitt's analysis to be thorough and well-reasoned, and the court finding the objections to be without merit and squarely addressed by Judge Blewitt's report (Doc. 8), it is hereby ORDERED that:

---

<sup>1</sup> Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. Supinski v. United Parcel Serv., Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at \*3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). "In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires 'written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.'" Id. (citing Shields v. Astrue, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at \*6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

1. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Blewitt (Doc. 8) are ADOPTED.
2. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction.
3. Petitioner's Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (Doc. 4) is DISMISSED as moot.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge